

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-3, 6, 7, 9-14 and 16 are present in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1 and 10 have been amended. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-3, 6 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Published Patent Application No. 2001/0025576 to Gottling. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Gottling publication discloses a cylinder of a rotary printing machine. The cylinder body 1 includes a cylinder casing 2 and first and second side parts 3, 4. The two side parts 3, 4 are mounted at the ends of the cylinder casing 2, with respective side part collars 5, 6 against the end faces of the cylinder casing 2. The separate side parts 3, 4 are centered relative to the cylinder casing 2 with a fit between an outside diameter of a side part shoulder 8 and an inside diameter of an annular groove 9 in the cylinder casing 2.

Although the cylinder casing 2 may arguably be characterized as an “adapter sleeve,” the separated side parts 3, 4 do not in any manner form a “core mandrel” as claimed. The separate side parts 3, 4 in the Gottling publication are rather secured in open ends of the cylinder casing (see, for example, Fig. 1).

In an effort to clarify this distinction, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the adapter sleeves each have an inside diameter sized to engage the core mandrel outside diameter across an entire width of the adapter sleeves. That is, the adapter sleeves when installed on the core mandrel engage the core mandrel outside diameter across their entire width. Support for this amendment can be found, for example, in Figs. 2 and 3.

Since at least this subject matter is lacking in the Gottling publication, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection is misplaced.

With regard to the dependent claims, without conceding the characterizations in the Office Action, Applicant submits that these claims are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on an allowable independent claim.

Although this rejection is premised under §102(b), Applicant notes that it would not have been obvious to modify the Gottling structure to utilize a core mandrel as claimed and thus include an adapter sleeve that engages the core mandrel outside diameter across an entire width of the adapter sleeve. Such a modification would in fact be contrary to the teachings in the Gottling publication. For example, in paragraph [0015], the Gottling publication describes the manner of connecting the cylinder to a journal rod 13. Gottling describes that the journals 10, 11 have hubs that bear against the outer end of the side parts 3, 4. Consequently, the complete cylinder body 1 can be pushed onto the rod 13 and, after the second journal 11 is inserted and a screw 12 is screwed in, the cylinder body can be firmly connected to the two journals 10, 11, the side parts 3, 4 being centered coaxially with the cylinder casing 2. Gottling further describes an embodiment where the cylinder is equipped only with the first journal 10. As such, Gottling in fact teaches away from any modification to include a core mandrel on which an adapter sleeve engages its outside diameter across an entire width of the adapter sleeve.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

Claims 9-14 and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Gottling. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With regard to dependent claim 9, Applicant submits that this claim is allowable at least by virtue of its dependency on an allowable independent claim. As noted, the Gottling publication does not provide any suggestion to modify its structure to correct those deficiencies noted above with regard to claim 1.

Independent claim 10 similarly defines a core mandrel having an outside diameter, and a plurality of adapter sleeves each having an inside diameter sized to engage the core mandrel outside diameter across an entire width of the adapter sleeves. As noted above, at least this structure is neither disclosed nor suggested in the Gottling publication. Applicant thus respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 10 is also misplaced.

With regard to dependent claims 11-14 and 16, without conceding the characterizations in the Office Action, Applicant submits that these claims are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on an allowable independent claim.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are patentable over the art of record and that the application is in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that anything further is desirable in order to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Prompt passage to issuance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: /Alan M. Kagen/
 Alan M. Kagen
 Reg. No. 36,178

AMK:jls
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203-1808
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100